

## Message Text

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 01 OECD P 09842 01 OF 04 171945Z

73

ACTION EB-07

INFO OCT-01 CIAE-00 COME-00 DODE-00 NSAE-00 TRSE-00 EUR-12

ERDA-05 ISO-00 EA-06 ACDA-05 MC-02 /038 W

----- 060388

R 171930Z APR 75

FM USMISSION OECD PARIS  
TO SECSTATE WASH DC 6602

C O N F I D E N T I A L SECTION 01 OF 04 OECD PARIS 09842

EXCON

E.O. 11652 XGDS1

TAGS: ESTC, COCOM

SUBJECT: COCOM LIST REVIEW - IL 1585 - PHOTOGRAPHIC  
EQUIPMENT

REFS: A. COCOM DOC REV (74) 1585/1

B. STATE 83466

C. COCOM DOC REV (74) 1585/2

SUMMARY: ROUND II DISCUSSION OF A REDEFINITION OF THE EMBARGO ON HIGH SPEED PHOTOGRAPHIC EQUIPMENT CENTERED UPON VERY TECHNICAL ISSUES FOR WHICH IT WOULD HAVE BEEN WELL FOR THE US DELEGATION TO HAVE AGAIN BEEN AIDED BY A COMPETENT TECHNICAL ADVISOR. HOWEVER, DURING THE COURSE OF A FULL DAY, THE COLLECTIVE COMMITTEE WISDOM SETTLED ON A SERIES OF COMPROMISES WHICH APPEAR TO BE REASONABLE AND GENERALLY CONSONANT WITH THE TECHNICAL AND INTELLIGENCE INFORMATION AVAILABLE TO THE USDEL. THE UK DEL, WHICH APPROACHED THIS ITEM WITH WHOLESALE DELETIONS IN MIND, SHOWED PARTICULAR FLEXIBILITY IN ATTEMPTING TO RESPOND TO US VIEWS EVEN THOUGH IT FOUND SOME OF THEM ILLOGICAL AND (IN THE LIGHT OF UK BELIEF IN SOVIET SUPERIORITY OVER THE WEST IN HIGH SPEED PHOTOGRAPHY) INSIGNIFICANT OR IRRELEVANT. ACTION REQUESTED: FINAL US INSTRUCTIONS SHOULD BE FRAMED UPON APPROVAL OF THE UNANIMOUS DESIRES OF THE OTHER MEMBERS, UNLESS ARGU-

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 OECD P 09842 01 OF 04 171945Z

MENTS CONVINCING IN TERMS OF THE COCOM CRITERIA CAN BE

ADDUCED IN SUPPORT OF US VIEWS. END SUMMARY.

1. DISCUSSION ON APRIL 14 OPENED WITH DISTRIBUTION OF THE REVISED US COUNTERPROPOSALS ON (A) AND (E) CONTAINED IN REF B. ATTENTION THEN TURNED TO THE UK PROPOSED RE-DEFINITION OF (A) CONTAINED IN REF C. AS PER INSTRUCTIONS US OPPOSED AND DELEGATIONS WERE POLLED ON THE US COUNTERPROPOSAL. THE HEADING WAS UNANIMOUSLY ADOPTED (UK AD REF).

2. ON (A)(1), THE UK OBSERVED THAT ITS ORIGINAL PROPOSAL HAD BEEN FOR DELETION OF THE WHOLE OF (A) BECAUSE OF BLOC EQUIVALENCE WITH THE WEST. ITS WILLINGNESS TO DISCUSS US PROPOSALS IN ROUND I WAS ITSELF A COMPROMISE. IT BELIEVED THAT THE US SHOULD BE WILLING TO COMPROMISE ON BRITISH VIEW THAT ITS COUNTERPROPOSAL IS EASIER TO READ AND UNDERSTAND THAN THAT OF THE US. THE UK HAD NOT INCLUDED THE US COUNTERPROPOSAL IN ITS OWN FOR THE REASONS STATED IN ITS JUSTIFICATION FOR REF C. THAT DELEGATION WISHED TO RECEIVE US VIEWS ON SEVERAL POINTS WHICH IT HAD FOUND INCOMPREHENSIBLE IN THE US COUNTERPROPOSAL AS FOLLOWS:

(A) IT WANTED TO KNOW WHETHER THE US RECOGNIZES THAT ITS (A)(1) CONSTITUTES AN EXTENSION OF THE PRESENT EMBARGO ON HIGH SPEED CAMERAS WHERE 8 MM FILM IS CONCERNED BECAUSE THE FULL FRAME SPEED FOR 8 MM FILM CORRESPONDING TO 3,000 FRAMES PER SECOND FOR 35 MM FILM IS 13,125 FRAMES PER SECOND (FPS) RATHER THAN THE 12,500 FPS LIMIT IN THE US COUNTERPROPOSAL;

(B) IT NOTED THAT 12,500 IS AN ACCEPTABLE SPEED FOR 16 AND 35 MM CAMERAS. HOWEVER, SETTING THE SAME SPEED LIMIT FOR 70 AND 90 MM FILM SIZES WHICH WOULD POSE GREAT TECHNICAL DIFFICULTY SEEMS INAPPROPRIATE IF AT THE SAME TIME THE US IS INSISTING ON INCREASED COVERAGE FOR 8 MM SIZE CAMERAS; AND

(C) IT WOULD APPRECIATE A SPECIFIC EXPLANATION FROM THE US ON WHAT IS WRONG WITH THE UK APPROACH TO (A)(1) WHICH RECOGNIZES THAT PHOTOGRAPHIC DEFINITION IMPROVES BY A FACTOR OF 4 USING A 16 MM FORMAT, BY A FACTOR OF 16 USING A 35 MM SIZE, AND BY A FACTOR OF HUNDREDS AT

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 03 OECD P 09842 01 OF 04 171945Z

THE 90 MM SIZE. IF AN EMBARGO IS NECESSARY, AS THE US INSISTS, IT SHOULD RECOGNIZE THAT BECAUSE OF THAT IMPROVEMENT IN DEFINITION, THE USES TO WHICH THE 8 MM SIZE CAN BE PUT ARE MARGINAL COMPARED TO THOSE FOR THE LARGER SIZES AND THAT THERE IS A GREAT DIFFERENCE IN TECHNOLOGICAL DIFFICULTY IN MOVING TO THE LARGER SIZES.

3. SUBSEQUENT DISCUSSION CONCERNED LENGTHY FRENCH IN-

QUIRY RE THE US INTENT IN PROPOSING A 12,500 FPS LIMIT

CONFIDENTIAL

NNN

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 01 OECD P 09842 02 OF 04 171956Z

73

ACTION EB-07

INFO OCT-01 CIAE-00 COME-00 DODE-00 NSAE-00 TRSE-00 EUR-12

ERDA-05 ISO-00 EA-06 ACDA-05 MC-02 /038 W

----- 060525

R 171930Z APR 75

FM USMISSION OECD PARIS

TO SECSTATE WASH DC 6603

C O N F I D E N T I A L SECTION 02 OF 04 OECD PARIS 09842

EXCON

ON ALL SIZES, AS WELL AS NON-SUBSTANTIAL WORDING CHANGES TO FACILITATE TRANSLATION INTO OTHER LANGUAGES. THE US DEL CONFIRMED THE FRENCH ANALYSIS THAT IF A 16 MM CAMERA WERE USED FOR QUARTER FRAME PICTURES THE SPEED FOR THAT CAMERA WOULD NECESSARILY BE LIMITED TO SOMETHING LIKE 3,125 FPS IN ORDER NOT TO EXCEED THE 12,500 FPS CUTOFF. ALL DELEGATIONS CONCURRED ON CORRECTIVE WORDING FOR THE US PROPOSAL. HOWEVER, IN VOTING, THE UK, CANADA AND FRANCE RESERVED ON THE US (A)(1) AND GERMANY (AD REF), JAPAN AND THE NETHERLANDS WERE OPEN-MINDED AND ITALY COULD APPROVE.

4. THE US WAS ASKED FOR BROCHURES PROMISED IN PARA. 28  
REF A RE "OPTICAL" DEVICES IN ITS (A)  
(2), AND IN VOTING, ITALY, NETHERLANDS, CANADA, FRANCE  
AND UK RESERVED PENDING JUSTIFICATION BY THE US FOR THE  
INCLUSION OF "OPTICAL", AND JAPAN WAS OPEN-MINDED. THE  
NETHERLANDS POINTED OUT THAT THERE IS A CONTRADICTION IN  
TERMS BETWEEN THE US WORDS..."CAMERAS EMBARGOED IN (1)  
ABOVE..." AND THE FIGURE 12,500 IN (A)(1). (NOTE: SINCE  
US PROPOSED 1585(A)(1) DEALS WITH CAMERAS AS SUCH, US  
DEL FELT THAT THE PHRASE IN PARA 2, REFTEL, "...THE  
EQUIPMENT IN (A)(1) ABOVE...", WAS MISLEADING SINCE IT

IS OUR (A)(2) WHICH DEALS WITH "EQUIPMENT." AS A RESULT, WE REVISED OUR SUBMISSION TO READ: "...TO THE CAMERAS EMBARGOED IN (1) ABOVE..." AS IT TURNED OUT, OUR FORMU-  
CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 OECD P 09842 02 OF 04 171956Z

LATION WAS NO BETTER AND ALSO CAUSED PROBLEMS.) THE US ACCEPTED THAT AS A MATTER FOR ATTENTION IN REVISING (A) (2). THE UK EXPLAINED THAT "OPTICAL DEVICES" WOULD NOT BE ADMINISTERABLE. THERE HAVE BEEN AVAILABLE FOR MANY YEARS HIGH SPEED ROTATING MIRRORS WHICH CAN BE USED AT SPEEDS GREATER THAN 12,500 FPS BUT WHICH SHOULD BE OF NO CONCERN BECAUSE THEY BLUR AND HAVE NO CHROMATIC BALANCE, AND THEREFORE PRODUCE POOR PICTURES. IN THE UK VIEW, THERE WOULD BE NO WAY IN WHICH TO DETERMINE IN WHICH CAMERAS SUCH DEVICES WOULD BE USED. FOR EXAMPLE, ONE COULD ADD A HALF FRAMEDEVICE TO DOUBLE THE SPEED OF A 5,000 FPS CAMERA TO 10,000 FPS, AND THE CAMERA WOULD STILL NOT BE EMBARGOED. HOWEVER, THE UK COULD NOT SEE THE NECESSITY OF THE US (A)(2), IF (A)(1) CAMERAS ARE EMBARGOED BY BEING "CAPABLE OF" SPEEDS OVER 12,500. FRANCE ASKED WHETHER THE US KNOWS OF AN 8 MM CAMERA WHICH CAN TAKE QUARTER SIZE PICTURES. CANADA ASKED WHETHER USE OF THE WORD "EFFECTIVE" RATES IN (A)(1) WOULD BE HELPFUL.

5. THE UK PROPOSED THE US HEADING FOR (A) WITH ITS OWN (A)(2) (REF C) AS A COUNTERPROPOSAL AND ALL DELS COULD AGREE EXCEPT THE US WHICH RESERVED BECAUSE "OPTICAL" WAS OMITTED AND DOUBTED THAT "SPECIAL ELECTRONIC DEVICES" ALONE WOULD BE SUFFICIENT FOR ITS AUTHORITIES.

6. WHEN ASKED FOR ITS POSITION ON DELETION OF (B) WHICH ALL OTHER DELS HAD ACCEPTED, US DEL MAINTAINED ROUND I POSITION OF RESERVE. UK REFERRED TO US STATEMENT IN PARA. 32 REF A AND SUGGESTED ONE MILLION FRAMES PER SECOND AT FULL FRAMING HEIGHT OF 35 MM WHICH REPRESENTS ONE-TENTH OF THE SOVIET CAPABILITY NOTED IN PARA 31 REF A. US AGREED TO FORWARD WITH RECOMMENDATION FOR ACCEPTANCE.

7. THE US AND FRANCE HAD RESERVED ON THE DELETION OF (C) IN ROUND I AND BOTH MAINTAINED THEIR POSITIONS. THE UK SUGGESTED A 1 NANOSECOND CUTOFF. FRANCE REPLIED THAT ITS MILITARY AUTHORITIES COULD AGREE ONLY TO AN EXPOSURE TIME OF LESS THAN 10 NANoseconds AND THAT THIS ITEM BE EXAMINED IN CONNECTION WITH SUBITEM (F).BOTH THE  
CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 03 OECD P 09842 02 OF 04 171956Z

UK AND NETHERLANDS REPLIED THAT IMAGE CAMERAS OPERATING OUTSIDE THE VISIBLE SPECTRUM ARE COVERED BY 1555 BE-CAUSE 1555 TUBES WOULD CONSTITUTE THE PRINCIPLE ELEMENT IN ANY CAMERA. THE NETHERLANDS WAS PARTICULARLY ANXIOUS THAT THE SEPARATION BETWEEN 1585 AND 1555 ACHIEVED IN 1972 SHOULD BE MAINTAINED. THE UK STRESSED THAT THEY HAD PRODUCED ONE OF THE WORLD'S EXPERTS IN ROUND I WHO REPORTED THAT THE SOVIETS AND CHINESE ARE DOING WELL IN CAMERAS AND ARE IN SOME CASES AHEAD OF THE WEST. THE UK AUTHORITIES ARE NOW OFFERING COMPROMISES WHICH THEY KNOW "IN THEIR HEART OF HEARTS ARE RIDICULOUS" AND IN THAT SPIRIT ASK THE COMMITTEE TO DELETE (C) AND (F). HE AGAIN CITED PARA. 36 REF. A FOR THE BENEFIT OF THE US AND FRANCE. USDEL, WHO WAS WITHOUT INSTRUCTIONS, BUT WITH OVERALL TTG INFORMATION SUGGESTING THE TRUTH OF THE UK STATEMENTS, AGREED TO RECOMMEND THE UK EVIDENCE. THE UK POINTED OUT THAT 90 OF THE IMACONS MENTIONED IN PARA.

CONFIDENTIAL

NNN

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 01 OECD P 09842 03 OF 04 171956Z

73

ACTION EB-07

INFO OCT-01 CIAE-00 COME-00 DODE-00 NSAE-00 TRSE-00 EUR-12

ERDA-05 ISO-00 EA-06 ACDA-05 MC-02 /038 W

----- 060521

R 171930Z APR 75

FM USMISSION OECD PARIS

TO SECSTATE WASH DC 6604

C O N F I D E N T I A L SECTION 03 OF 04 OECD PARIS 09842

EXCON

36 HAD BEEN PRODUCED BY DECEMBER 1973. OF THAT NUMBER 12 WERE INDUSTRIAL, 43 WERE FOR PLASMA WORK AND ONLY 35 WERE FOR DEFENSE RELATED USES, BUT MOST OF THOSE WERE FOR PLASMA WORK. HE ASKED FOR US AND FRENCH VIEWS ON THE SIGNIFICANCE OF (C) IN THE LIGHT OF BLOC LEADERSHIP.

US HAD ASKED WHETHER THE IMACON WERE THE DEFINITIVE CAMERA IN ITS CLASS, BUT THE UK DECLINED TO COMPARE IT INTERNATIONALLY AND MERELY DESCRIBED IT AS "TYPICAL". US DEL CONTINUED RESERVE AND NOTED THAT WHILE IT WOULD REPORT DETAILS OF IMACON SALES GIVEN BY UKDEL, IT HAD RECEIVED INFORMATION THAT 1974 DEVELOPMENTS IN THE US HAD OPENED WAY FOR CAMERAS FOR EXPLOSION OBSERVATIONS NOT PREVIOUSLY ACCESSIBLE. NOTE: WHILE WE RECOGNIZE HOW HARD TTG HAS WORKED TO PRODUCE REFTEL INSTRUCTIONS, WE FRANKLY COULD NOT UNDERSTAND PARA 4 SUFFICIENTLY TO USE IT AS A BASIS FOR OBJECTION. IF THIS POSITION IS CONFIRMED, WE WOULD APPRECIATE A MORE DETAILED, MORE READABLE REVISION. WE WOULD, HOWEVER, POINT OUT THAT REFTEL SPEAKS ONLY OF WHAT CAN BE COMBINED". DO SUCH CAMERAS INDEED EXIST? IF SO, MORE CONCRETE DETAILS WOULD BE NECESSARY TO MAKE A CONVINCING CASE TO OTHER DELS.

ALL ACCEPTED OR WERE OPEN-MINDED ON THE STATEMENT OF UNDERSTANDING REQUESTED BY THE US AS A CONDITION FOR THE DELETION OF (D), PROVIDED REFERENCES TO IML 4 AND 11 WERE DELETED. THEY WERE, AND THE SOU IS ACCEPTED.

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 OECD P 09842 03 OF 04 171956Z

9. THE US MAINTAINED ITS RESERVE ON THE DELETION OF THE PRESENT (E) WHICH ALL OTHER DELS HAD ACCEPTED. THE US PROPOSAL FOR A ONE-TENTH MICROSECOND CUTOFF IN ITS PROPOSAL FOR (E), THE PRESENT (F), BROUGHT UK QUESTIONS CONCERNING SPECIFIC MILITARY APPLICATIONS ABOUT WHICH FRANCE AND THE US MIGHT BE CONCERNED IN THE RANGE BETWEEN THE ONE NANOSECOND, WHICH THEY HAD OFFERED IN COMPROMISE DESPITE THE SOVIET CAPABILITY IN THE PICOSECOND RANGE TO WHICH THAT DEL HAD REFERRED IN PARA. 7 ABOVE AND THE 10 OR 100 NANOSECOND RANGE CITED BY FRANCE AND THE US. THE US REPLIED THAT THERE ARE CAMERAS OF MILITARY INTEREST, TO WHICH THE UK REPLIED THAT THERE ARE UNDOUBTEDLY MILITARY USES FOR CAMERAS AT ONE-SIXTIETH OF A SECOND YET NO COVERAGE HAS BEEN PROPOSED. THE UK STRONGLY DESIRED TO KNOW WHAT PARTICULAR ACTIVITIES WOULD BE INVOLVED BETWEEN ONE AND ONE-HUNDRED NANoseconds. THE FRENCH DEL NOTED THAT (F) CAMERAS DO NOT EMPLOY IMAGE CONVERTERS OR LUMINESCENCE AMPLIFIERS AT 10 NANoseconds WHERE USED IN CONNECTION WITH HYDRAULICS STUDIES. FRANCE HAD REFRAINED FROM SUGGESTING 1 NANosecond BECAUSE, FOR MOST SURFACES, LUMINESCENCE AMPLIFIERS WOULD BE NECESSARY. HOWEVER, FRANCE NOTED THAT MOST INDUSTRIAL PURPOSES CANNOT BE SERVED AT 100 NANoseconds. THE FRENCH EXPERT NOTED THAT THESE ARE "ONE-SHOT" CAMERAS EMPLOYING KERR CELLS. HE RECALLED THAT IN REV (68) 1572/2, RE LIGHT RECORDERS AND PARTS, FRANCE HAD MADE THE UNCONTESTED STATEMENT THAT KERR CELLS USED

OUTSIDE OF LASERS ARE NOT EMBARGOED UNLESS IN LASERS.  
THE UK REJOINED THAT IT HAD NOTED HIGH SOVIET CAPABILITY  
IN KERR CELLS AT THE PICOSECOND LEVEL IN PARA. 62 OF REF  
A. US HAD STATED THAT IT WOULD REQUEST A JUSTIFICATION  
TO BE CIRCULATED BETWEEN ROUNDS. IN VOTING GERMANY, UK  
AND FRANCE RESERVED ON THE US PROPOSAL AND JAPAN, CA-  
NADA AND NETHERLANDS COULD BE OPEN-MINDED ON THE US PRO-  
POSAL ALTHOUGH THEY HAD ACCEPTED DELETION OF (F). NOTE:  
OTHER DELS HAD NO DIFFICULTY AT ALL IN TRANSLATING  
1/10 MICROSECOND INTO 100 NANoseconds AND FOUND IT WANT-  
ING. WE ARE CONCERNED THAT REFTEL PARA. 6 RETREAT FROM  
TTG RECOMMENDATION OF 1 NANosecond CUTOFF FAILS TO TAKE  
ACCOUNT OF COCOM CRITERIA. EVEN IF WHAT WE WANT TO PRO-  
TECT IS A 20-NANosecond SHUTTER SPEED CAMERA, WE SEEM  
CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 03 OECD P 09842 03 OF 04 171956Z

TO HAVE BUILT IN AN 80-NANosecond CUSHION. ON THE  
OTHER HAND, IF THAT CONCERN FOR THE 20-NANosecond CAMERA  
IS TO BE SUPPORTABLE BY A LIMIT OF, SAY 30-NANoseconds,  
WE SHOULD BE ABLE TO INFORM COMMITTEE IN MORE DETAIL OF  
NUMBERS, DETAILS, AND APPLICATIONS OF THAT CAMERA. IN  
VIEW OF THESE FACTORS, USDEL DID NOT MAKE REFERENCE TO  
THE CAMERA TO JUSTIFY OUR COUNTERPROPOSAL.

10. ON THE US PROPOSAL (I) ADDING HARD SURFACED HIGH RE-  
SOLUTION PLATES, THE UK RECALLED US STATEMENTS IN PARA.  
69 REF A AND EXPRESSED CURIOSITY ABOUT US INTEREST IN  
SEEKING COVERAGE HERE AS WELL AS (B)(4)(2) OF 1355 IN  
WHICH IT SEEKS TO EMBARGO HARD SURFACE PLATES. SIMILAR-  
LY THE US PROPOSED (B)(5)(1) PHOTOMASK FABRICATION MA-  
CHINES MIGHT ALSO BE AN APPROPRIATE PLACE FOR COVERAGE.  
USDEL ASKED WHETHER (B)(4)(2) AND (B)(5)(1) ARE ACCEPT-  
ABLE TO THE UK. THE UK PROFESSED TO BE STUDYING THAT

CONFIDENTIAL

NNN

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 01 OECD P 09842 04 OF 04 172003Z

73

ACTION EB-07

INFO OCT-01 CIAE-00 COME-00 DODE-00 NSAE-00 TRSE-00 EUR-12

ERDA-05 ISO-00 EA-06 ACDA-05 MC-02 /038 W

----- 060634

R 171930Z APR 75

FM USMISSION OECD PARIS

TO SECSTATE WASH DC 6605

CONFIDENTIAL SECTION 04 OF 04 OECD PARIS 09842

EXCON

ITEM. US INDICATED THAT IT WAS NOT SEEKING DOUBLE COVERAGE, BUT THAT IN THE CHRONOLOGY OF ITS PREPARATIONS THIS PROPOSAL HAD PRECEDED THAT FOR 1355. THE UK THEN ASKED WHAT THE US IS TRYING TO COVER WHICH IS NOT ALREADY IN (B)(5) OF THE PRESENT 1355. THE NETHERLANDS INDICATED THAT ITS REMARKS IN PARA. 72 HAD IMPLIED THE SAME INTERPRETATION. IN RESPONSE TO A US INQUIRY, THE UK INDICATED THAT ITS AUTHORITIES APPLY (B)(5) TO EMBARGO THE PLATES IN QUESTION AND TRUSTED THAT THE US HAVE APPLIED IT IN THE SAME WAY. FRANCE OBSERVED THAT (I) HAD BEEN INTRODUCED IN 1972 AND ALL THESE QUESTIONS SHOULD HAVE BEEN ANSWERED THEN. THE NETHERLANDS ASKED WHETHER INTRODUCTION OF THIS ITEM HAD BEEN INTENDED AS A RELAXATION TO 1355. US REPLIED NEGATIVELY BUT WOULD INQUIRE. IN VOTING BEFORE THE UK REMARKS ON 1355, JAPAN AND CANADA HAD ACCEPTED, FRANCE AND GERMANY COULD ACCEPT WITH A SENSITIVITY FIGURE OF 0.5 TO 1 DEGREE ASA AND A 2-YEAR VALIDITY NOTE. AFTER THE UK AND NETHERLANDS RESERVED AND NOTED THAT THE PLATES ARE ALREADY COVERED, GERMANY CHANGED ITS POSITION TO AD REF FOR FURTHER STUDY (PRESUMABLY RE DOUBLE COVERAGE).

11. US SUGGESTED DELETING OF WORDS "AND FILM" AND ALL DELS ACCEPTED WITH FRENCH NOTING THAT DELETION IS LOGICAL BECAUSE FILMS DO NOT ATTAIN THE INDICATED RESOLUTION.

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 OECD P 09842 04 OF 04 172003Z

12. ACTION REQUESTED: BELIEVE REVIEW OF US (A)(1) AND (2) ARE IN ORDER BASED ON COMMENTS OF OTHER DELS. IN FINAL ANALYSIS, AND IN THE ABSENCE OF EXPERT ADVICE, WE BELIEVE THAT THE COLLECTIVE COMMITTEE WISDOM HAS PRODUCED A WORTHWHILE FORMULATION INCLUDING THE US HEADING; UK (A)(1) AND (A)(2); A ONE-MILLION FPS CUTOFF IN (B); A ONE-NANOSECOND CUTOFF IN (C); DELETION OF (E); A ONE-NANOSECOND CUTOFF IN THE US (E)(WHICH IS THE PRESENT (F) BUT WHICH WOULD BECOME NEW (D); AND DELETION OF THE

NEW COVERAGE IN THE US (I) ON THE UNDERSTANDING THAT ALL  
DELS CONSIDER IT ALREADY COVERED BY IL 1355 (B)(5).  
THIS RECOMMENDATION IS SUBSTANTIATED NOT ONLY BY UK TES-  
TIMONY, BUT ALSO BY THE TTG OF NOVEMBER 25, 1974, BE-  
GINNING AT THE BOTTOM OF PAGE 3 THROUGH PAGE 4, AND PAR-  
TICULARLY BY THE STATEMENTS THAT "US WEAPONS EXPERIENCE  
SUGGESTS THAT BY FAR THE MOST FAVORABLE HIGH SPEED CA-  
MERA CAPABILITY IS ACHIEVED BY DEVELOPING ONE'S OWN.  
THERE ARE SIMPLY NO CAMERAS ANYWHERE THAT WE KNOW OF THAT  
ARE SO GOOD (AS THE SOVIET ONES) WITH RESPECT TO SPACE  
AND TIME RESOLUTIONS AND F NUMBER THAT COMPROMISES IN  
THE TECHNICAL COMPETENCE OF THE OPERATING PERSONNEL CAN  
BE PERMITTED WHEN COMPETING WITH THE BEST INSTALLATIONS  
TODAY. IN THE TWO AREAS, THE PRESENT (C) AND (F), WHERE  
THE TTG IS SILENT, UK TESTIMONY SHOULD BE GIVEN particu-  
lar attention because the British have informed us bi-  
laterally that they are so absolutely certain of their  
ground that US objections will create insuperable credi-  
bility problems for them with their ministers. UK vehe-  
mence on this item appears to be sincere because they  
apparently have no rope left beyond 1 nanosecond compro-  
mise in (C) and (F) if deletion is not accepted by the  
US. Given general thrust of US intelligence in the  
November 25 TTG and Adamant UK attitude, we recommend ap-  
proval of the action above before round III.

TURNER

CONFIDENTIAL

NNN

## Message Attributes

**Automatic Decaptoning:** X  
**Capture Date:** 01 JAN 1994  
**Channel Indicators:** n/a  
**Current Classification:** UNCLASSIFIED  
**Concepts:** STRATEGIC TRADE CONTROLS, EXCEPTIONS LIST, REORGANIZATIONS, PHOTOGRAPHIC EQUIPMENT, MEETING REPORTS  
**Control Number:** n/a  
**Copy:** SINGLE  
**Draft Date:** 17 APR 1975  
**Decapton Date:** 01 JAN 1960  
**Decapton Note:**  
**Disposition Action:** RELEASED  
**Disposition Approved on Date:**  
**Disposition Authority:** GarlanWA  
**Disposition Case Number:** n/a  
**Disposition Comment:** 25 YEAR REVIEW  
**Disposition Date:** 28 MAY 2004  
**Disposition Event:**  
**Disposition History:** n/a  
**Disposition Reason:**  
**Disposition Remarks:**  
**Document Number:** 1975OECDP09842  
**Document Source:** CORE  
**Document Unique ID:** 00  
**Drafter:** n/a  
**Enclosure:** n/a  
**Executive Order:** X1  
**Errors:** N/A  
**Film Number:** D750135-0332  
**From:** OECD PARIS  
**Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Image Path:**  
**ISecure:** 1  
**Legacy Key:** link1975/newtext/t19750442/aaaabmsj.tel  
**Line Count:** 465  
**Locator:** TEXT ON-LINE, ON MICROFILM  
**Office:** ACTION EB  
**Original Classification:** CONFIDENTIAL  
**Original Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Original Previous Classification:** n/a  
**Original Previous Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Page Count:** 9  
**Previous Channel Indicators:** n/a  
**Previous Classification:** CONFIDENTIAL  
**Previous Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Reference:** 75 COCOM DOC REV (71585/1  
**Review Action:** RELEASED, APPROVED  
**Review Authority:** GarlanWA  
**Review Comment:** n/a  
**Review Content Flags:**  
**Review Date:** 02 JUN 2003  
**Review Event:**  
**Review Exemptions:** n/a  
**Review History:** WITHDRAWN <19 MAY 2003 by GarlanWA, 3.4.X9>; RELEASED <02 JUN 2003 by GarlanWA>; APPROVED <02 JUN 2003 by GarlanWA>  
**Review Markings:**  

Margaret P. Grafeld  
Declassified/Released  
US Department of State  
EO Systematic Review  
05 JUL 2006

**Review Media Identifier:**  
**Review Referrals:** n/a  
**Review Release Date:** n/a  
**Review Release Event:** n/a  
**Review Transfer Date:**  
**Review Withdrawn Fields:** n/a  
**Secure:** OPEN  
**Status:** NATIVE  
**Subject:** COCOM LIST REVIEW - IL 1585 - PHOTOGRAPHIC EQUIPMENT  
**TAGS:** ESTC, US, UK, COCOM  
**To:** STATE  
**Type:** TE  
**Markings:** Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 05 JUL 2006